

## **SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES**

**Meeting of Thursday, October 21, 1993  
Room BC-110, 10:00**

**Present:** S. Ali, P. Bird, T. Bui (Chair), U. de Brentani, A. Homzy, A.B. Ibrahim, E. Loo (recording secretary), P. Shizgal, K. Thulasiraman, J. Wilkinson, A. Williams

**Regrets:** P. Lightbown, K. Lipke, D. Markiewicz, C. Suen

**Absent:** T.E. Nagar, J.F. Plamondon

#### **DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

##### **In advance**

- SRC-10-21-93-D1 Report of the Task Force on Senate Reform.
- SRC-10-21-93-D2 Proposed Policy Statement on Educational Equity at Concordia University.
- SRC-10-21-93-D3 Copy of letter dated September 30, 1993 from Claude Hamel, president of CREPUQ to Peter Morand of NSERC, re: NSERC Strategic Planning - Towards 2000.
- SRC-10-21-93-D4 Memo dated October 5, 1993 from Tien Bui to C.L. Bertrand, Re: "Expert Task Force on Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities.
- SRC-10-21-93-D5 Long Range Directions in Computing, Communications, and Information.

##### **At the Meeting**

- SRC-10-21-93-D6 1992-1993 Summary of Research Grants and Contracts awarded to Concordia University Researchers.
- SRC-10-21-93-D7 Minutes of the Task Force on Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities, held October 8, 1993.

## DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

### At the Meeting

SRC-10-21-93-D8 Documents dated October 12, 1993 from MRC/NSERC/SSHRC entitled "Integrity in Research and Scholarship" and "Procedures for Promoting Integrity and for Preventing and addressing Misconduct in Research".

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m.

#### **1. Approval of Agenda (SRC-10-21-93-A)**

The agenda for the meeting was approved.

#### **2. Approval of Minutes (SRC-09-23-93-M)**

A. Williams noted that in response to D. Markiewicz's remark in Section 7 c), MRC did contact the University for input. On a motion made by A.B. Ibrahim, the Minutes of the meeting of September 23, 1993 were approved.

#### **3. Business arising from Minutes**

Chair reported the following:

- The Task Force on Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and facilities met on October 8, circulated for your information is a copy of the Minutes of Meeting (Document SRC-10-21-93-D7).
- 7. c) Review of FRDP - A committee will be set up to look at the criteria for the evaluation of the programme. It is planned to complete the review of the FRDP programme in early spring of 1994 and to submit its finding and recommendation to Senate in March or April.
- The Chair met C. Hyde to discuss about the Capital Campaign. Depending on the nature of our proposal, C. Hyde will work on the "clientele" for the project.

The Capital Campaign should be tabled for the next SRC meeting.

#### **4. Report of the Chair**

Chair welcomed the new representatives for the SRC for the academic year 1993-94:

- Dr. S. Ali, Mathematics, member-at-large
- Dr. P. Lighbown, TESL, member-at-large
- Mr. T. Nagar, undergraduate representative
- Mr. J.F. Plamondon, Graduate representative
- Ms. J. Wilkinson, Graduate representative

#### **5. Report of the Director, Office of Research Services**

A. Williams reported the following:

- 1) At least three new team applications went in and one of them is from the Faculty of Fine Arts. FCAR Centre Committee will make a site visit in November at CSBN.
- 2) The 1992-93 Summary of Research & Contracts Report is a little more difficult to read this year because three important changes have been recorded in the research database namely: indirect cost received from MESS, Concordia's participation in inter-institutional Projects and CIDA grants. There is an increase of about 3% in funding for research activities and Table 1 shows and increase of 15.6% because of the changes in the database.
- 3) Two years ago MRC had a position paper, based entirely on scientific integrity in Research and this came before SRC for discussion. We did not hear from them since then, a few days ago she called them, they had just finished the document and they faxed it to her. The document has been put together by the three major federal granting agencies: MRC/NSERC/SSHRC. Document to be forwarded to Dr. F. Bird's Committee on the University Code of Ethics.

#### **6. Question Period**

Committee members asked whether the indirect cost is an allocation from the Ministry to the University and whether there is a system to find out where the fund goes?

A. Williams remarked that the allocation is probably used to fund the FRDP as well as other Internal Grants.

S. Ali remarked that there is a problem about insuring university equipment.

A. Williams said that she raised this problem with Dr. C. Bertrand and was told that the baseline must be \$5,000 and normally it involves items which are portable and whose costs are more often under \$5,000. The purchase of insurance for replacement of these type of losses is not cost efficient.

## 6. Question Period

P. Bird noted that when he spoke to Dr. C. Bertrand a while ago, he was informed that the Task Force on Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities will consider the situation but he does not see it as an item in the document.

## 7. a) Report of the Task Force on Senate Reform (SRC-10-21-93-D1)

Chair stated that in May 1992 Senate approved the establishment of the Task Force on Senate Reform to review the mandate, structures and functioning of the Senate and in September 1992 Senate appointed the members of the Task Force. At the beginning of this September, the Task Force submitted to Senate the first draft of the report which has been forwarded to SRC for discussion.

It was noted that the main thrust of the Document on Senate Reform is to make academic central to the decision making process of the University, to give faculty stronger voice and to increase contact between the Board of Governors and Senate. Tagged along with this is the restructuring of the standing committees of Senate. For reasons which are unclear the document talks about greater integration and proposes merging of committees. One of the committees is the SRC which is replaced by Committee 6. Since teaching and research are the main activities of the university, this committee 6 would then have the purview of everything that the University does. This purview would be so broad that nobody believes it will work and the composition of the committee would be so big to make it functionable! To make it worse, the responsibility of this committee is defined as advisory Senate on support and services for teaching and research but not the promotion of research, the promotion of excellence and the liaison with the external world. The SRC plays the role of representing the university in external committees such as the Royal Commission and various levels of governments, gives input to policies documents produced by various granting agencies. What we see here is that the SRC will disappear into the larger purview of teaching and research!

Chair asked committee members what they suggest for input to Senate and remarked that there will be probably a special meeting of Senate regarding this document.

Question was raised about the mandate and structure of existing Standing Committees of Senate:

- Steering Committee
- Academic Planning and Priorities Committee
- Academic Programmes Committee
- Research Committee
- Academic Services Committee
  - Undergraduate Scholarships and Awards Sub-Committee
  - Sub-Committee on the University Writing Test
  - Sub-Committee on Academic Computer Policy
- Appeals Committee
- University Library Committee
- Computer Resources Committee

**7. a) Report of the Task Force on Senate Reform (SRC-10-21-93-D1)**

It was remarked that there is a lack of comparison between the old committee and its mandate and the new committee and its mandate. May be SRC should make a summary of its mandate and a list of what has been done through the past years and ask which committee should be doing these things.

Chair suggested that there should be a small ad-hoc committee to look at these issues and proposed U. de Brentani and P. Shizgal to join in.

The following documents should be prepared:

- A summary of the accomplishment of the SRC
- A list of all SRC documents that have been approved by Senate.

**7 b) Proposed Policy Statement on Educational Equity at Concordia University (SRC-10-21-93-D2)**

Chair noted that this document has been forwarded for consideration and response.

The Committee supported the main thrust of the document. However there were some concerns in how this document might be viewed and debated in the context of research. The interest of the document was to address certain practical concerns and some suggestions were made for example with regard to the extension of the FRDP internal grant for reasons such as maternity leave. The Committee viewed this document as an attempt to reinforce and to articulate the mission statement of the University.

**8. For information only:**

- a. Copy of letter dated September 30, 1993 from Claude Hamel, president of CREPUQ to Peter Morand of NSERC, re: NSERC Strategic Planning - Towards 2000 (SRC-10-21-93-D3).
- b. Memo dated October 5, 1993 from Tien Bui to C.L. Bertrand, Re: "Expert Task Force on Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities (SRC-10-21-93-D4).
- c. Long Range Directions in Computing, Communications, and Information (SRC-10-21-93-D5).

**9. Varia**

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.